

1026. f. 11. 14.
14

THE NATURAL GROUNDS AND MEASURES
OF CHARITY.

A

S E R M O N

PREACHED in the

CHURCH of St. NICHOLAS

At. L I V E R P O O L,

BEFORE THE

TRUSTEES of the INFIRMARY,

A T T H E I R

ANNIVERSARY MEETING May 8 1765,

PRINTED BY THEIR DESIRE,
AND FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CHARITY.

By E. OWEN, M. A.

Master of the FREE SCHOOL of WARRINGTON.

L O N D O N:

Sold by T. FIELD in PATER NOSTER ROW, W. NEW-
TON in MANCHESTER, T. LEDSHAM in CHESTER,
and by the Booksellers in LIVERPOOL and
WARRINGTON.

MDCCLXV.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1913

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

T O
ROBERT GWILLYM Esq.
P R E S I D E N T,
AND TO THE REST OF THE TRUSTEES
O F T H E
P U B L I C I N F I R M A R Y
E S T A B L I S H E D
I N L I V E R P O O L,
This D I S C O U R S E

Is inscribed, with the greatest Respect,

By Their most obedient,

Humble Servant,

E. OWEN.

T O

ROBERT GWILLYM ESQ

PRESENT,

TO THE REST OF THE TRUSTEES

OF THE

PUBLIC INFIRMARY

ESTABLISHED

IN LIVERPOOL

THIS DISCOURSE

is inscribed, with the greatest Respect,

By THOMAS ROBERTSON,

Minister of the Gospel,

F. OWEN.

1 Sam. xxvi. 10, 11.

And Nabal answered David's servants, and said, Who is David? and who is the son of Jesse? there be many servants now a days that break away every man from his master.

Shall I then take my bread and my water, and my flesh that I have killed for my shearers, and give it unto men whom I know not whence they be?

IT requires a great degree of virtue to preserve a modest and humane temper in a state of affluence. We see our fortunes entirely formed by outward causes: The chance of birth, a train of accidents, or the course of our own conduct places some in wealth and others in poverty. And it requires more reflection, than what we care to give ourselves in the ease and comfort of enjoyment, to look beyond the *visible* means of our subsistence for the direction of a *superior* will in these allotments. It is no less grating to our pride, in the complacency of an exalted situation, to consider those, as creatures of the same value with ourselves, whom we see below us, toiling in meaner offices for our convenience.

BUT

BUT as these views of life are unfavourable to the cause of humanity, it may be worth our while to look deeper into the matter; to enquire into the natural foundation of the several orders, and to consider charity as it arises from this original source.

THE greatest happiness, we are capable of, plainly lies in a state of society. In the unconnected state of savage equality, individuals, if they could subsist at all by their own rude self-instructed efforts, must raise the necessaries of life with difficulty, and possess them under the perpetual fear of yielding to the first invader of superior policy or strength. Society enlarges the sphere of enjoyment. It infinitely multiplies the comforts of life by the circulation of mutual services and inventions; and gives them stability by its protection. For this reason, equal as we are in the *essential* privileges of nature, it is expedient we should be distinguished from one another in the *external* circumstances of condition. Some must be laid under the necessity of labour, the natural source of our conveniences; and others must have leisure and influence and authority to watch over the security of possession.

AT the same time, this disparity of circumstances is really no evil in itself; self-enjoyment being nearly equal in all conditions. The cares of greatness, compared with the peace, the sound sleep, and chearful health of labour, leave one little to boast of and the other to repine at; did not our folly estimate happiness by glitter rather than inward satisfaction.

BUT

BUT from this constitution, however wisely adapted to the *general* happiness of man, the evil of distressed poverty must *occasionally* arise. For in a system, made up of a great variety of parts descending below one another in a gradual chain of subordination, there must be several, barely removed above want, living upon the regular issues and returns of their industry. When, therefore, from the common frailty of our contexture, infirmities invade their bodies, they must of course fall into distress. As free creatures we must be governed by general laws: For were there not a *settled* course of things to give particular actions their determinate consequences, there could be no call to industry, forecaste, or contrivance. And general laws, amidst the infinite multiplicity of particular cases, will accidentally hurt individuals, while they serve the common advantage. Free creatures will sometimes make a wrong use of their powers. And by the connexion subsisting between us no one can suffer without involving others in his fate. The evil of poverty, therefore, arises from the very constitution of society; and, as this is calculated for the general happiness, we may consider all sufferers as really so many *sacrifices* to the *public utility*.

BUT what is still of greater importance, we must consider this as the appointment of God. Amidst the numerous proofs of a providence, I cannot help considering the system of man, irregular as it is, as bearing the most obvious marks of divine direction.

Is it wisdom to adapt means to ends? Here is the greatest of ends, the general welfare of mankind

kind, provided for, by various classes wonderfully conspiring, by their mutual dependence and subserviency, to form a regular connected community. Do some by folly or misfortune sink from their natural preeminence in this constitution? Others, by a frugal cast, superior talents, and other methods, are raised to take their places, and prevent the system from falling into confusion. Would it create the most fatal convulsions, if the orders were left to the competitions of self-love, under a *fortuitous* cast of talents and inclinations? We come into the world with a diversity of capacities and tempers, adapting us to the several departments of civil life; and leading us, almost necessarily, to make different choices and engage in different pursuits. Would society, notwithstanding these provisions, still fall to pieces, if there were not some common principle or bond of union? We are placed under the strongest; the *necessity* of mutual dependence. The great, in spite of their pride, must protect the poor upon whose labours they subsist; and the poor, in spite of their envy, respect the great, under whose patronage the fruits of their labours are enjoyed. There is no one, who is not indebted to the united power of the whole for his safety, and the labours of the different arts for his conveniences. We can *visibly* trace the subsistence of a *day* to the contributions of a thousand different orders: and if we consider the *remoter* multitudes, that must still depend upon them in continued progression, and the support which we all receive in common from the ascending orders, we shall have some faint idea of the closeness

ness as well as utility of civil association. And that we might not forget mankind amidst the narrowness of *local* societies, we see the comforts of life scattered in different countries and climates; in order to point out an universal community, and to lay us under the necessity of cultivating it by the civilizing arts of commerce.

LET us only reflect: the unbeliever himself acknowledges wisdom and design in the order and regularity of the *material* world. Allow man must be a free agent, and here are greater marks of order and contrivance. How astonishingly great must it be, to form a complicated machine, as wide as human nature, consisting of millions of free creatures, acting separately upon private interest with distinct and opposite views, and yet compelled by the difference of their powers, inclinations, and necessities to act like so many regular movements for the *general* welfare: compacted and held together by these secret, imperceptible, I had almost said, imaginary relations, which leave them *free* and yet *bind* them with the firmness of *links of iron*, which the outrages of free-will may disturb but cannot destroy!

THESE observations, if they are not perhaps too abstracted, open to us the natural grounds and measures of charity. While they teach us that the distinctions of life are to be preserved, and that self-love, domestic attachments, and all honest arts of acquiring and preserving fortunes are not only innocent but laudable, as being the *real supports* of civil association; they point out our unhappier brethren,

brethren, at the same time, as objects of our tenderest compassion.

FOR when a man, wrapped up in the sordid narrow circle of private interest or pleasure, cries, *who is David, and who is the son of Jesse? who are the poor and what are they to me? Shall I give unto men, whom I know not whence they are?* He disclaims acquaintance with those who are united to him in the closest relation.

RECALL our former idea of savage equality. Imagine mankind turned loose into this state, overreaching, destroying, and preying upon one another; every one living solitary and unbefriended, exposed to ruffian violence, insecure of his cottage his limbs and his life, fearful suspicious and jealous of an enemy in every creature he meets — Compare with this the peace, the security, the multiplied conveniences, we receive from the concurrent offices of associated numbers. Go on, and consider how weak and impotent every individual is in himself. He enters into life helpless in *infancy*: and the care of others nurses him to maturity. He grows helpless again in advanced years, the *second infancy* of man; and the same friendly care supports him as he totters off the stage. In his full maturity of *strength* he is subject to pains which the skill of others must remove, or their tenderness alleviate; and to wants, which their labours or friendship must supply. When a man has struck the deepest root, when he rears his head the highest, and defies the storms of fortune, yet then, as the stateliest tree is fed by the meaner fibres of the root that lie below in the earth, so he oweth

oweth his whole strength and verdure to the labours of his inferior fellow creatures.

Now, upon this view, does not gratitude and justice incline us to the *charitable* conclusion: that, as we owe our happiness to society, and distress arises from social subordinations, that part of us, who are *happy* by this constitution, owe assistance to the meanest member of it; as one who contributes to our felicity, as one who suffers by our enjoyments?

THE case, indeed, of the *useless* part of a community is a forcible objection. For they, who do no service, have no returns to expect. And the selfish man, to put a fair colour upon his inhumanity, pretends that *all* distresses belong to this class; that distresses are wholly of *our own* creation. *Many servants now a days, says he, break away from their masters and lawful occupations, and bring misery upon themselves by their folly, idleness, and other vices.* But the plea is false: Much misery, as we saw before, arises *necessarily* from the social constitution. And as for *voluntary* irregularities, which will also arise, it is our duty to prevent them, as far as possible, by salutary regulations. The resolution of the case, I think, is this: the *industrious* poor have an undisputed right to a comfortable provision: the idle and worthless to a relief suitable to their *circumstances*; that is, such a relief as tends by a mixture of discipline and religious instruction to correct their vices, and dispel their ignorance, the great parent of vices in the lower orders, and in short

short to reclaim them to the purposes of their creation. For till men have by outrage *actually* forfeited their right to the *protection* of society, they must be considered as a *part* of it, and have a claim to its offices.

THE obligation encreases upon us, when we come to consider further, that this constitution is the appointment of the common creator, who is the giver of riches and expecteth they should be laid out agreeably to his will.

CHARITY is commonly considered as an arbitrary discretionary duty. But I know no difference between *charity* and *strict justice* but this, that justice has a fixed determinate invariable object, and may therefore be made the subject of human laws: But that charity varies according to the indeterminable extent of sufferings and abilities, and must therefore be left to the private conscience. At the same time, if there be a supreme governor, who is capable of *over-looking* our *consciences*, and hath commanded charity in full proportion to what conscience itself must pronounce to be our abilities; it becomes then matter of strict justice and indispensable obligation.

I KNOW how averse nature is to consider those fortunes as a trust, which we honour with the name of independence. But it is the pride of nature, and the fallacy of language. To be raised above the capricious humours of fellow creatures is possible indeed: and it is a comfort: it is one of the blessings of affluence. But to consider wealth as a *mere* instrument of self-enjoyment, in
order

order to feed the insatiate eye of avarice, or to pamper our lusts in all the wantonness of expence; to think ourselves at liberty (as it is said of the great Leviathan in the waters) *to sport and take our pastime therein*, attentive to nothing but our own private gratifications, is claiming an impossible independence. To be so independent, we must go out of the government of God.

YET this is the uncharitable man's folly: *Shall I take*, says he, *MY bread, and MY water, and MY flesh, that I have provided FOR MY OWN conveniences, and give unto men whom I know not whence they are?* — Infatuated man! those *outward causes*, to which you ascribe your fortunes, are but the *instruments*, as I shewed you before, by which God is pleased to govern the world, and really gave you your possessions. *Beware* (saith the Mosaic law with equal truth and eloquence, *Beware*) *that thou say in thine heart, my power and the might of my arm hath gotten me this wealth. But thou shouldest remember the Lord thy God: for it is HE that GIVETH thee the POWER to get wealth.* For comes it by thine own industry? It was he that gave thee that health, capacity, and opportunity, that enable thee to prosper above thy meaner brethren. Comes it from the industry of thy forefathers by the regular transmission of inheritance? It was his favour that thou wert born of *this* rather than *that* parent: *For, he made us and not we ourselves.* It was his providence, that appointed and still supporteth those general laws, which transmitted thy

C

inheritance

inheritance to thy possession: For *he* not only made us; but *we* are his people and the sheep of his pasture.

WE must now recal our former view of society. We are all equal in the privileges of nature: But some must be placed in higher and others in meaner conditions for the good of the world. This occasions particular cases of distress. The creator cannot relieve them by extraordinary interposition without superseding the purposes of general laws. At the same time, he has given a *sufficiency* for all. And does he not teach us by this appointment the obligation, nature, and measures of beneficence? that the *few*, who suffer thus for the benefit of the world, should be relieved from the fullness of the *happier multitude*? that they should be relieved with tenderness, as fellow creatures equal by nature and equally dear in the common maker's impartial eye; and with discretion, as creatures still placed below us for the wisest purposes of order?

No other sort of relief deserves the name: Relief, arising from the uncertain impulses of *humour*, like irregular interrupted showers, answers not the general exigences of want. The spendthrift's *profusion*, breaking the order of nature, falls, like the thunder shower, exhausting itself by its violence, and doing no permanent service; destroying, rather than refreshing; falling where least wanted, among the pests and nuisances of society, but seldom reaching the silent obscurity of modest want. Whereas true charity founded in sentiment is (if I may

may pursue the metaphor) a shower *in due season*; prompted by goodness, regulated by prudence, and directed by discretion, it always falls where there is need, nor disables itself for the beneficent discharge upon all future occasions.

INDEED the creator seems to teach us this charity by the silent language of all his works. It is now pretty generally known, that the whole material world is governed by one common attractive principle, that acteth upon all bodies according to what we may call their degrees of *relation* and *merit*, I mean their distances and quantity of matter; allowing every body its own centre, yet drawing the whole into one common system. What a beautiful emblem of christian benevolence! While it allows self-love its private centre; while it acteth more strongly upon nearer relations; it extendeth its regard to remotest interests, to all want according to its respective deserts, and connecteth the whole rational creation. But this is rather abstruse: let us view the more obvious appearances of nature, and we shall find nothing made for its own use: preeminence in nature is but the preeminence of doing good. If the heavenly bodies (for instance) roll in superior splendor over our heads, it is but to spread heat, and light, and comfort more widely in their course: if the mountains rise above the plains, and receive the dews of heaven in greater abundance, it is only to collect and disperse them in plenty over the inferior plains: if the ocean receives the tributary rivers from every country; it is to return them again in refreshing

vapours, and to recruit the fountains that support its greatness. Carry your view in the same manner through the tribes of animal and vegetable life, and you find the same order and connexion. Ascend to man: and God hath done the same for him; having formed an astonishing arrangement and œconomy in the general distributions of society. More he cannot do, consistent with our freedom; but points out to us, through all these works of his, what he expects from our freedom towards supporting and completing the beautiful connexion.

BUT whatever weight these silent intimations carry along with them; the argument, drawn from the social affections, I think, amounts to demonstration. It is this. There is a *good-nature* in the frame of man, that constantly connecteth him with his fellow-creatures, where meaner instincts do not prevail; participating in their joys, and feeling in their misfortunes. We must do *violence* to ourselves, to restrain it; to indulge it is the sweetest of pleasures.

IN the cool impartial review of *history*, who takes not part with injured innocence? Who does not the same in *life*, where his own interests are not strongly concerned? Who curses not the cruel, even amidst the threats of power and the glare of splendid rapine? We read of a cruel tyrant of antiquity,* who oppressed and murdered his subjects without remorse, and yet melted into tears at the imaginary distress of theatric representation.

What

* Alexander of Pheræ. see Plutarch in Pelopidas.

What was this but the honest triumph of nature? Evil habits may now and then smother the amiable instincts of the soul; but in some ingenuous unguarded disinterested moment she will discover her better tendency: passions may now and then, like a hurricane, overbear the powers of reflexion; but, when the storm subsides, benevolence breaks forth again, and surveys the wreck with remorse and horror.

VIEW this instinct in the indulgence, and what gives so sincere and permanent a pleasure! Do we weep with those that weep? There is a pleasure in catching the soft infection, and a refreshment in discharging the social torrent. Do we feed the hungry? We share in the repast, and feel the most exquisite luxury, when we see joy rekindled in the meagre face of want. Do we cloathe the naked? And do we not feel a glow of transport overspread ourselves, when we see a poor fellow creature comforting himself in the *warmth of our fleece*? — Other pleasures vanish with the enjoyment; and, if sinful, leave a bitterness upon the mind: but the memory of generous actions is a fund of comfort for every period of life, and will support the mind in that hour of need, the hour of death, when all other comforts forsake us. — In the mean time, it is health and enjoyment: Some how, the heart expands in the consciousness of doing good: the stream of life flows with recruited vigor: the mind feels a complacency and self approbation, that gives a relish to every other satisfaction.

THE

THE selfish man, I know, will laugh at these pleasures, and with an air of superior sagacity inform us, that he sees every wise man act, like himself, upon private interest, whatever be his pretences. But the answer is short: there is a distinction (which candor only can make) between the self interest of *prudence* and *immoderate desire*; and, if the latter destroys benevolence in *some* cases, it disproves not the *general* instinct. There are men born without hands or feet; but we consider them as monstrous and unnatural productions. And, in the same manner, we should consider the man, as a monster in the moral world, who wants that natural tenderness, which for the honour of the human species we call humanity.

THE argument, upon the whole, stands thus: God sends us helpless infants into the world: and we see he has implanted a natural instinct in the parent prompting him to assist the helplessness of infancy. We all see the *relation* in this instance: the *miser* owns it; for his pretence is to provide for his children. In the same manner does the common creator leave some of his creatures poor and destitute? Why have we benevolent affections implanted in us, if we are not to exercise them in the relief of distress? why are we not criminal, in proportion to the degrees of relation, for neglecting a similar instinct, equally founded in nature? The voluptuary, again, insists upon his right to follow pleasure. Let him also pursue his principle, and he he will find himself acting contrary to nature; when, neglecting the superior pleasures of doing
good

good, he swallows up his whole wealth in the joyless gulph of private gratification.

WHATEVER force these arguments have in proving riches to be a real important trust, the gospel puts it beyond doubt or dispute. We live here in a state of discipline. The various conditions, that are so wisely contrived for our general comfort, are the trials of our obedience. The poor are tried in the virtues of honest industry and resignation; the rich in the temperate and charitable use of their wealth. There is not a mite of those over-grown possessions, which the great ones of the earth consider as the instruments of their vices and follies, which they must not give the strictest account of to omniscience.

BUT let us avoid superstitious scruples. The gospel, agreeing with the general views of nature, alloweth the primary demands of self-love, the claims of domestic relation, and supposes a difference of ranks and orders.

THERE is another allowance to be made. By the peculiar humanity of our laws there it no man of property, who cannot consider himself as employing part of his fortunes in charitable uses. For, while the national provision for the poor does honour to our public spirit by raising the disabled above the misery of precarious maintainance, every man can make his legal proportion a charity by the chearfulness of his contribution. Men of rank and office may turn it into the most valuable charity by taking care to see the laws executed with an humanity equal to their spirit. There are numerous

merous inconveniences attending establishments left merely to mercenary care, which the interposition of superiors only can prevent or remove.

BUT this provision, however managed, will not answer the distresses of mankind. Misery will break in from a thousand sources which no laws can foresee or provide for. Whenever, then, such an object presenteth itself — when you can, by a little seasonable relief, preserve a worthy man pursued by a train of misfortunes and enable him to recover and go comfortably and usefully through life — when you can, by your contribution, rescue an orphan family from hunger and nakedness, from the wretched alternative of either perishing for want, or taking the mischievous paths of vagrant idleness; when you can give servants to your God, and useful members to your country by implanting in them early and lasting habits of piety and industry — when you can, by your contribution, restore a laborious useful man deprived of his limbs and health in the service of mankind (for this is the case of every industrious man; when you can restore him) to himself, to his family, to the community; and prevent the complicated misery of the many depending on his honest labours — when, I say, any such object presenteth itself to your relief, and yet you cannot retrench from your lusts, from your superfluities, nay from your conveniences; there is an *abuse* of wealth, if the world is governed by a Being of mercy and compassion.

HAST thou, O God, made all of the same nature, stamped alike with thy sacred image, and
impressed

impressed with the same desire of happiness; and shall so many of thy creatures languish in hopeless misery? Their neighbours lend not a hand to relieve them; they see them without pity; they spurn them from their doors; they mock at their misfortunes. Must the complaint of the poor be forgotten forever? Must one riot in wealth, and forget the hand that gave it; and another live under thy chastisement, and dutifully bless the hand that afflicteth so severely?

SURELY, no: The moralist is wrong, who, telling us that *partial evil is universal good* leaves misery without hope in death. "For my part (the christian moralist * better concludes) if there were but *one* instance of unfortunate virtue and prosperous wickedness, it would be to me an argument for a future state: because God cannot be unjust or unreasonable in any *one* instance."

WE see, we hear of, *numerous* instances of this kind. The uncharitable man *multiplies* them by his *cruelty*, and becomes an argument against himself; being a certain visible demonstration of the necessity of a more equal state.

IF it appears, therefore, upon so many firm and obvious principles, that our fortunes are a *real* trust, it certainly becomes us to consider what account we can give of them in the great day of enquiry. "I gave thee power; I gave thee riches: "I placed, below thee many, who are equally "dear to me, to toil for thy convenience: What
C "hast

* Woollaston Sect. 9. 8.

"hast thou done to repay *my* goodness, and to
 "reward *their* labours? I look upon me the cause
 "of these virtuous poor: I placed them in the
 "world for the exercise of their patience, and the
 "trial of thy obedience. Give an account of those
 "talents, which I committed to thy trust."

IF, in that important hour, our conscience upbraids us, that we hoarded up in avarice or spent upon our lusts that wealth, which we owed to temperance and charity; how can we face the consequent expostulation?

"I GAVE *you* every thing amply to enjoy: I
 "cloathed you with the riches of my creation:
 "yet *I* was naked and perishing in the person of
 "*these* poor, whom I trusted to your relief, and
 "you denied to my nakedness the superfluities of
 "your pride. I gave you every beast of the field
 "for your support: every element contributed to
 "crown your tables with plenty: yet I was hungry
 "and thirsty, and ye denied me the refuse that
 "fell from the tables of your riot and intemperance. I gave you health and peace and security: the voice of mirth and joy resounded in your dwellings: yet I was sick, and ye took me not in; in prison, and ye visited me not; while you squandered away my gifts upon your lusts and vices."—

WHAT follows—I need not mention in a christian audience. But it is certain, the state of happiness, designed for us hereafter, is a place, where flesh and blood with its pollutions cannot enter; where love and peace and benevolence are the reigning tempers.

BLESSED,

BLESSED, then, is the man, who prepares himself, in this his day of grace, for that future inheritance; that he may receive the final approbation, which the good and charitable can only receive, which will be of more value than millions of worlds; *Well done, thou good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful in a few things, I will make thee master over many things: Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord!*

A FEW words will be sufficient by way of application. It will be neither necessary nor becoming to attempt the passions of a people, who are so charitable upon sentiment and principle, who share so eminently of the humanity of the present age. And it is sufficiently known, that public receptacles for the infirmities of nature are calculated to promote the most generous and useful views of charity.

Is it charity to melt at the distress of a mangled or diseased fellow-creature struggling and agonizing under pain? Infirmarys do more than solitary compassion can effect: They present an object to the joint advice and assistance of the most ingenious in every place; an advantage, which the richer few only can enjoy: and they render the charity of individuals more extensive by the frugality of one common direction. Is it still a nobler compassion to reconcile the thoughtless to the duties of society and the better prospects of futurity? Infirmarys present the wretched object to the offices of religion in that serious state, in which the mind is most susceptible of good impressions; when the circumstance

stance of being relieved by the generous effects of virtue must give it an additional recommendation. Does charity enjoy its fullest triumph, when it sees its relief properly and successfully disposed? The annual returns of infirmaries exhibit the most transporting of prospects. MULTITUDES RELIEVED; all restored to the service of the community, and many, very probably, to the higher purposes of their creation!

As these things are * sufficiently known, so it is unnecessary also to observe, that the peculiarity of your situation cuts you off from the contributions of an extensive neighbourhood: and the efforts of your charity are eminently great and generous, in proportion to this disadvantage.

WHAT, then, has a minister of religion to do, under these circumstances, but to applaud so glorious a spirit, and to pray that your example may kindle a similar emulation in the adjacent country; that so beneficial a scheme may not only be supported but enlarged, and raised more and more above the contingencies of casual contribution!

* This topic is discussed at large, with equal judgment and elegance, in the Hon. and Rev. Mr. Stanley's Infirmary Sermon for the year 1750.

T H E E N D.